

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

Chair Neff called an Adjourned Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:05 p.m., **Wednesday, June 23, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Randy Neff, Chair
Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Vice Chair
Michael Christianson
Shakil Patel

Commissioners Absent: Eric Essex

Staff Present: Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

Consultants: Lloyd Zola, LSA Associates
Lynn Calvert-Hayes, LSA Associates

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

There were no items to be added or deleted.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were no oral reports.

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-19 - GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT - The project is a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan, which was originally adopted in 1973. A Draft General Plan document has been prepared based on public input received in various public workshops over the past two years. The draft document has been designed to respond to and reflect the City's changing conditions and community goals in order to guide the City's development during the next twenty years. The project boundaries include all of the City's corporate limits and the Sphere of Influence in the San Bernardino County unincorporated areas generally located south of Redlands Boulevard, east of California Street, south of Barton Road and west of the San Timoteo Creek Channel, and the southeast portion of the South Hills area into San Timoteo Canyon and south to the Riverside County line. The Draft General Plan document addresses issues and sets broad policies related to Land Use, Community Design, Circulation, Economic Development, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Public Services and Facilities, and Historic Preservation.

Chair Neff explained that following Staff's status report on the May 19, 2004 meeting, the focus of the Planning Commission would be to discuss the revisions to the Hillside Mixed-Use Designation, Section 2.2.3, the General Plan Implementation Programs Element (Element 11.0), and the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), Response to Comments and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

Director Woldruff reported that at the May 19, 2004 meeting, the Planning Commission completed the review of the Public Health and Safety and the Conservation and Open Space Elements. She added that the Commission's goal was to review the revised Hillside Mixed-Use Designation in the June 2004 version of the Draft General Plan, and cover the General Plan Implementation Programs, Element 11. Ms. Woldruff suggested that the Planning Commission begin with the revised Hillside Mixed-Use Designation and proceed with the discussion of the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report, the Responses to Comments and the Mitigation

Monitoring Program and take public testimony at the conclusion of both presentations to answer questions that would be brought up during public testimony.

Director Woldruff explained that the June 2004 version of the Draft General Plan was provided to the Planning Commission, and contained minor revisions, grammatical and punctuation changes, as well as some major revisions to the Elements already reviewed. She introduced Mr. Lloyd Zola consultant of LSA Associates and opened the discussion regarding the revisions to the Hillside Mixed-Use Designation section.

Mr. Zola explained that the revisions to the Hillside Mixed-use section followed the concept of 5 units/acre on the bench areas north of the toe of slope; the area south of the toe of slope would have a maximum density of 2 units/acre for those areas that are not subject to the Hillside Initiative and areas subject to the Hillside Initiative would have a density of 1 unit/10 acres consistent with the provisions of the Initiative.

Mr. Zola stated that the basic vision for the Hillside area was primarily a series of upper end housing projects/developments with larger houses and a high level of amenities for the neighborhoods such as walking trails, small parks and other features that would make the neighborhoods walkable. He added that for the community, the General Plan envisioned a series of trails and amenities allowing access for the public to the basic open spaces that would be preserved.

Mr. Zola explained that the Draft General Plan proposed an urban density for the lower benches on the eastern side with projects that would include small parks, trails, and developed open spaces with the potential for cutting back the parcels on north/south trending hills, with contour grading forming a second bench, with view opportunities, at a slightly higher level. He added that the benefit in exchange for the urban densities in the lower areas would be keeping the primary face of the hill as open space.

Mr. Zola explained that on the western portion of the hills, mass-graded pads would be considered to the south of the Initiative area where they are not visible from the valley areas to the north. He added that the Draft General Plan would allow developers to purchase development rights from the Initiative Area in exchange for retiring development rights in the initiative area to be kept as permanent open space.

Mr. Zola addressed the questions regarding commercial development in the Hillside. He explained that the proposed commercial development would provide the daily needs of residents of the Hillside, especially on east side, and commercial recreation amenities, such as a golf course and stressed the fact that the commercial development in the Hillside would not be the shopping mall type of development.

Chair Neff asked Mr. Zola to describe the different types of grading methods. Mr. Zola explained that in a hillside area such as in mountain communities houses are built on custom pads, to provide a flat pad for each home, using a split-level plan, or a basement, which were called custom foundation or grading. He explained that a mass graded pad would provide a flat pad on a rolling area for a subdivision; the objective of that type of grading was to concentrate development on mass-graded pads leaving the surrounding areas in the natural open space rather than scattering units over a large area and having to build roadways to get to those homes.

Chair Neff had questions regarding manufactured slopes. Mr. Zola referred to the two graphics on Page 2-10 of the Draft General Plan, which illustrated the difference between a manufactured slope and a contour slope, the latter using varied slopes to recreate a natural looking contour. On a question from Commissioner Christianson, Mr. Zola stated that Implementing Policy p) on Page 2-11 contained language that addressed contour grading.

Mr. Christianson requested more information on the amenities referred to earlier in Mr. Zola's presentation. Mr. Zola explained that there he was referring to two types of amenities: "public" amenities, such as a trail system in the natural open space open to the public; and the other, amenities for the residents of a developed area, to create a planned community atmosphere.

Commissioner Christianson asked if the densities shown on Page 2-8 were the densities that would be approved for the development of the Hillside area. Mr. Zola explained that each project would be judged on a case-by-case basis for its conformity to several criteria and policies prescribed in the General Plan. He added that the maximum density set forth in the General Plan was not a guarantee to developers, that the proposed densities were parameters for the Planning Commission to review with the each project.

Commissioner Christianson asked about gnatcatcher and other endangered species. Director Woldruff explained that each project would have to prepare an EIR that would address this issue.

She added that the Development Code, which would set standards based on the policies of the General Plan, would provide more specific regulations.

Commissioner Christianson wanted to be really clear on 2.6 that talked about what we consider to be densities. In the City of Loma Linda in our land use: low density – 2.1 to 5 du per acre, medium density 5.1 to 9 dw per acre, medium high density – 9.1 to 13 dw per acre and high density – 13.1 to 20 dw per acre. He wanted to make sure that those densities were parameters and if a project comes in at the top end of a parameter we are not obligated to pass it at that density. Director Woldruff said that the caps were there and typically projects are reviewed by cities within a density range. If someone wants to do the highest density the idea that they better provide some pretty spiffy amenities to obtain the rights to those densities. It's up to the Planning Commission and the city Council to determine the requested density. Mr. Zola reiterated that the City would approve a project requesting maximum density. He added that the proposed development must be consistent with the density range and relevant policies of the General Plan, meet all development standards and provide a product that the city actually wanted. He continued to say that the Planning Commission must have a justification for changing the density of the project, other than not liking what came before them, and If the project meets all of the requirements of the General Plan, the City must provide findings regarding the determination made by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Rosenbaum: where would the text appear that would set policies to protect sensitive habitat areas. Mr. Zola referred to Section 2.2.3 (c) and explained that the clustering of houses was put into the General Plan to minimize the number roads. Commissioner Rosenbaum asked if the word "habitat" could be added to ensure that sensitive habitat was protected.

Commissioner Christianson asked if a map illustrating the ridgelines would be added to the General Plan. Mr. Zola replied that it was the consensus that the individual projects would be required to demonstrate view sheds and be addressed on a case-by-case analysis of each project.

Mr. Zola stated that language would be added to 2.2.3 (c) that would say "resources and habitat" and also identify that the idea is to minimize the road cuts through natural areas to provide access to individual home sites.

Chair Neff pointed out that 2.2.3 (i) also addressed clustering and asked if Sections 2.2.3 (c) and (i) could be combined. Mr. Zola stated that he would make the changes.

Chair Neff suggested that the Planning Commission's discussion be turned to the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report. Director Woldruff introduced Ms. Lynn Calvert-Hayes who prepared the DEIR as the environmental consultant with LSA Associates. She informed the Commission that Ms. Hayes would present a 15-minute PowerPoint presentation regarding the preparation of the Draft Environment Impact Report (DEIR) and Response to Comments and would detailed information on the results of the City of Loma Linda's DEIR.

Ms. Hayes explained the process for the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and the issues and outcomes evaluated in the process, and the obligations of the Planning Commission in regards to the DEIR. She stated that the process began with the Notice of Preparation (NOP), which informed the public that the City of Loma Linda would be preparing an EIR. She continued to say that the NOP document went out for public review for 30 days as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of the State of California from October 30 to December 30, 2003. Ms. Hayes continued to say that the concerns expressed in the nine letters received were related to how the implementation of the General Plan would affect aesthetics, the loss of biological habitat, the loss of cultural resources both paleontological and archeological as well as historic, impacts on potable water, water quality, drainage and flooding, increases in traffic and noise, and its effects on recreation and parks and that no new issues were raised during the informal public testimony at the public Scoping meeting held on November 12, 2003. She added that comments from both the Scoping meeting and the written received on the NOP were used to prepare the Draft EIR, which was presented on March 22, 2004 and made available for the required 45-day public period from March 22 to May 6, 2004. She stated that nine comment letters were received, eight from agencies and one from the general public.

Ms. Hayes stated that the Planning Commission was provided with the final Program EIR, which was the result of the comment letters received on the draft EIR, the City's responses to those comments, an addendum to the Draft EIR, and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan presented as a table in the EIR, which evaluated the large-scale impacts of a program, such as a General Plan, on the environment and was not site specific but the results of the cumulative effects of all the development occurring in the City as part of implementing the General Plan. She added that all projects coming before the Planning Commission for review would still need to be reviewed for their environmental effects as required by CEQA.

Ms. Hayes stated in the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report assumptions were made as follows:

- Build-out over 26 years with a final build-out in the year 2030
- Acreage 6,000 acres
- Dwelling unit count was 17,231
- Population at build-out would be 37,649, assuming a population rate of 2.3 persons per dwelling unit
- Office and commercial beyond institutional uses and determined that there would be 27,000 jobs created through land uses

Ms. Hayes continued her presentation stating that the Program EIR was very general in nature and had been prepared using the 15 different topic areas as follows:

- Aesthetics & Visual Resources,
- Air Quality,
- Biological Resources,
- Cultural Resources & Paleontology,
- Geology & Soils,
- Hazardous Materials,
- Water Resources,
- Land Use & Agricultural Resources,
- Flooding Hazards,
- Noise,
- Population & Housing,
- Transportation & Circulation,
- Parks & Recreation, and;
- Public Services & Utilities, which encompasses Fire and Police Protection, Public Education Facilities, Library Services, Wastewater, Solid Waster, Energy Resources,

Ms. Hayes also explained that there were some topics that were required by law that a General Plan must evaluate. Those topics are:

- Growth Inducing Impacts,
- Cumulative Impacts,
- Consistency with Regional Plans, and;
- Alternatives.

Ms. Hayes reported that there were five areas of study that could not be mitigated to less than significant impacts with the implementation policies of the General Plan as well as mitigation measures. She emphasized that this was not unusual and that any plan of this size would have significant unavoidable adverse impacts especially in the following areas:

- Aesthetics – Loss of open space
- Air Quality – Vehicle emissions
- Biological Resources – Loss of critical habitat, isolation of sensitive habitat
- Water Resources – Increase in the demand for water
- Traffic – Cannot ensure needed improvements in surrounding communities and freeway would be implemented

Ms. Hayes explained that under CEQA, the City had to evaluate alternatives to the proposed General Plan to determine if the significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the implementation could be mitigated.

Ms. Hayes stated that the documents under consideration were the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report, along with the Response to Comments, and Mitigation Monitoring Program. She added that staff was recommending that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that they approve and certify the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report, as well as make findings and statements of overriding considerations for those effects that were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Commissioner Christianson wanted to know if staff was suggesting that the Commission could be choosing the alternatives. Director Woldruff replied that the first two alternatives of the Draft EIR, No project/No build and No project/Existing General Plan, were issues that must be considered under State law. She added that the Planning Commission could also act upon and make recommendations regarding the other two alternatives, Reduced Residential Hillside Density and Increased Residential Density, emphasizing that the Commission give great consideration to the ramifications resulting from any changes made to those issues.

Chair Neff asked if the biological impacts could be mitigated through a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). Director Woldruff replied that the County of San Bernardino was in the process of preparing an HCP but that she could not say if the mitigation of biological impacts could be addressed through an HCP. Ms. Hayes commented that mitigation measures included in the Draft General Plan did reduce the impacts on biological resources but not to the “less than significant” level. Mr. Zola explained that the provisions in the Draft General Plan would require every individual project to mitigate to the “less than significant” level.

Chair Neff invited discussion on the responses to comments on the Draft EIR. Director Woldruff explained that there were nine letters received during the public review period that ended on May 6, 2004 and that most of the letters referenced the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA). Ms. Hayes noted that one change suggested by the City of San Bernardino in regards to the traffic modeling had no significant change and was added to the Final EIR on Page 4.3. She continued to say that other letters received were from the State Clearing House acknowledging that the City of Loma Linda had met its obligation under CEQA, a letter from (SCAG) stating that the City and the Draft EIR were in conformance with the regional plan, and a letter from Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) with questions regarding pre-zoning.

Chair Neff wished to discuss the Mitigation Monitoring Program and asked Ms. Hayes to briefly review the comments for the Program. Ms. Hayes explained that the Mitigation Monitoring Program was set up as a checklist as follows:

- Mitigation measure
- Name of the person or agency responsible for monitoring
- Monitoring frequency
- Timing of verification
- Method of verification
- Sanctions for non-compliance

Chair Neff thanked Ms. Hayes for her presentation and, as there were no other comments, directed the discussion to Element 11 – General Plan Implementation Programs and invited the Commissioners to provide their comments and concerns.

The following issues were briefly discussed and Mr. Zola replied that the appropriate changes would be made:

- a change in the wording on Page 11-4, Section 11.1 (e) #(3) - to replace “healing art” with “medical sciences”.
- The text on Page 11-5, of Section 11.1 (f) the last bullet be changed clarify the meaning.
- Page 11-8, Section 11.2, add a statement to include cooperation with other agencies on mass transit.
- Page 11-9, Section (c), someone asked if the Redlands Unified School District should be included in this paragraph. Mr. Zola explained that it was a lot more difficult to deal with private teaching establishments that it was with public school.

Commissioner Christianson wished to discuss Section 11.2 (e) – Involve the Community in the Development Review Process, on Page 11-9. He asked if language could be added to address additional notification to the public for public hearing meetings. Mr. Zola stated that at the time of the review of the Zoning Ordinances the current notification process could be modified them to allow for wider notice to inform the public regarding upcoming projects. Director Woldruff concurred with Mr. Zola as to various ways to inform the public of proposed projects. She added that the language did not need to be in the General Plan.

Director Woldruff suggested that the responses to the following letters received in the last year regarding the Draft General Plan be put in the public record before Chair Neff opened the meeting for public testimony. :

- 1) Mary Lynn Cooke, representing the Budget Committee, the Senior Center Board and the Trails Development Committee provided three letters from which revisions were made to the Draft General Plan;
- 2) Paul Hsu, ADR Development, suggested a map change on the east side of California Street in the City’s sphere of influence from business park to mixed-use, which was resolved in one of the workshops;
- 3) Eric Ray from San Bernardino International Airport Authority asking that the Airport Influence Area Map required by recent legislation be added;
- 4) Jeanette “Golly” Gilbert, expressing her concerns regarding the change in Land Use Designation from residential to commercial, were noted and her letter added to the documentation provided to the Planning Commission and City Council. She added that the City of Loma Linda was not interested in taking any of the properties;

- 5) Robert Stewart, whose comments were noted and considered in the most recent version of the Draft General Plan and copies of his letter would be provided to the Planning Commission and City Council;
- 6) Glenn Elssmann, Mission Development Company had submitted a letter of comment, which had been noted and provided to the Planning Commission and City Council;
- 7) Dr. Donald G. Pursley, Loma Linda University Adventist Health Sciences Center, submitted a letter suggesting a goal regarding limiting non-institutional traffic on portion of Anderson Street between Barton Road and the railroad tracks; Staff replied that the letter was reviewed and it was determined that the proposed goal cannot be included in the Draft General Plan and especially the Transportation & Circulation element because Anderson is a public street and the City of Loma Linda cannot reduce, eliminate, or control of traffic but that it may be considered at a later date if the future construction and improvement dictated to alter the circulation in that area;
- 8) John Jaquess, City of Redlands, was concerned with the consistency and compatibility of land use patterns between our common boundaries in regards to the mixed-use designation in the area; staff replied that the mixed-use would allow some flexibility to meet market needs;
- 9) Leroy Hansberger, H&E La Cresta, commented on the changes requested to the Hillside mixed-use designation. A workshop held on April 19, 2004 resulted in changes to the mixed-use designation and that Mr. Hansberger's concerns had been addressed;
- 10) Peter Cowley, property owner on Starr, had concerns about the mixed-use designation in that area, which could possibly result in the University building a parking lot. Mr. Cowley was informed that any proposal would require public hearings and staff assured him that he would receive notification as a property owner;
- 11) Daniel Kopulsky, Caltrans Division of Aeronautics, whose comments were not relevant to the City's General Plan;
- 12) Douglas Welebir, property owner at the west end of the City, concerning the designation of his property in the Hillside Conservation Area. The map has been revised to reflect the change;
- 13) Glenn Elssmann, Deer Park LLC, a similar request to Mr. Hansberger's were addressed through the workshop and the revision done on the Hillside mixed-use designation;
- 14) Anwar Ragdi, City of San Bernardino, comments were addressed through the Draft Environmental Impact Report;
- 15) Caltrans District 8, concerns regarding changes to the TIA would not affect the General Plan or the EIR;
- 16) A letter received from Thomas C. Zirkle, Jonathan Zirkle, and Jim & Kay Jesse, and James and Asia Pang, property owners at the southwest corner of Barton Road and Oakwood Drive, request that the land use designation for the properties fronting on Barton Road be changed to a higher residential density of up to 20 units per acre. Staff replied that allowing higher densities for the property would create a small island of high density on the General Plan, referred to spot zoning;
- 17) Kathy Glendrange, regarding meeting noticing and the need for more public workshops. Staff pointed out that the City of Loma Linda has had 17 public workshops, six Planning Commission study sessions and 10 public hearings; many of the comments were directed towards the Draft EIR rather than the Draft General Plan and her letter was dated outside the 45-day public review period. She is concerned about impacts to habitat, biological resources and conservation. Staff replied that the General Plan Land Use Plan and Map was developed with community input, which was received at the various workshops and those concerns were addressed through the Draft Program EIR;
- 18) Elizabeth Wright, with SCANPH, had several issues that were supposed to have been put the last version of the Housing Element. Some were missed and were added to the current version;
- 19) An anonymous letter regarding development on Mission Road regarding the proposed medium densities of up to 9 dwelling units per acre in the area.

Chair Neff opened public comment period at 8:50 pm.

Kathy Glendrange, 26551 Beaumont Ave presented the comments on the following issues:

- No changes to the hillside

- More advanced notice of documents and meetings
- General Plan to reflect what residents want
- Hillside issue is the most controversial
- Concerns on new draft General Plan:
 - Mixed-use designation for hillside not appropriate for all areas of hillside
 - More residential designation in hillside
 - Clarification about “anticipated maximum” density
 - Density is too high
 - Clarification on formula for density transfer in Hillside Initiative
 - Clarification on clustering in regards to number and designation
 - Determine a maximum density for clustered developments
 - Lower residential hillside density alternative ever seriously considered
 - Wants to wait until Glen Elssmann presents his master plan for Hillside development; has extended an invitation to Glen Elssmann to meet with residents and present his proposed project
 - Concerns of residents as far as trails and open space
- Wants PC to postpone approval until there is more discussion

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road addressed the Planning Commission regarding the following concerns:

- Discussion on the Pang’s, the Jesse’s and Zirkle’s request for a higher density for their property, on Barton Rd at Oakwood to allow condos;
- Does not consider it spot zoning because other property already have different zoning;
- Trails in Hillside valuable assets and deserved to be conserved. He added that he was a member of the subcommittee for South Hills Trails Master Plan.

A lengthy discussion on the Trails Subcommittee ensued.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, stated her concerns to the Planning Commission:

- Asked PC to delay their recommendation to City Council for the general plan and the EIR;
- Mixed-use in hillside not strict enough;
- Density is too high;
- Increase in traffic;
- No infrastructure to support development;
- Business to serve new residents.

Wayne Isaef, 24988 Lawton Avenue addressed his concerns to the Planning Commission:

- Provisions in the General Plan be enforced so that Mountain View Avenue and Anderson Street don’t become through streets into the hillside area;
- Amenities vs. clustering, development density on Mission Road not be repeated;
- Make strict determination and clear guidelines regarding lot sizes in hillside.

Peter Crowley, 24979 Starr Street commented on the following issues to the Planning Commission

- Concerns about mixed-use in healthcare zone on Starr;
- More open space less development in hillside;
- Concerns regarding infrastructure for hillside development.

Chair Neff summarized the common concerns of Loma Linda residents, as follows:

- Clarification regarding clustering and the estimated density of the proposed developments;
- Incorporation of trails throughout the south hills and the concept of public trails on private property;
- Traffic and future access to the south hills;
- Infrastructure for city services and needed amenities for those areas.

Chair Neff stated that the concerns expressed by the public should be addressed. He suggested that the Planning Commission schedule a meeting to address the comments. Mr. Zola suggested that the public hearing be closed and a date scheduled to answer the concerns of the residents and take action on the Draft General Plan. Director Woldruff suggested that the Planning Commission select a second meeting date in July and that staff would poll the absent commissioners continue the item until the July 21, 2004. Chair Neff asked for a motion regarding the continuation of the item.

Mr. Zola explained, that in order to allow members of the public an opportunity to review the responses to comments on the Draft General Plan, he would work with staff to complete a summary of the responses by July 14, 2004. He added that the action the Planning Commission

would be to recommend the document to City Council. He added that more public hearings would be done at that level.

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Patel, and carried by a vote of 3-0, (Essex and Rosenbaum absent) to adjourn the meeting to a special meeting on July 21, 2004 to answer the concerns presented during the public comment period at the June 23, 2004 meeting and to close the public hearing.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of March 17, 2004, and the Minutes of the Special Meeting of March 31, 2004 were continued the next meeting due to a lack of a quorum of members present at those meetings.

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Patel, and carried by a vote of 3-0 (Essex and Rosenbaum absent) to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 5, 2004.

NOMINATION AND APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAR FOR THE NEW TERM BEGINNING JULY 1, 2004

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Patel, and carried by a vote of 3-0 (Essex and Rosenbaum absent) to continue the Nomination and Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair for the new term beginning July 1, 2004 to the next meeting.

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

There were no reports by the Commissioners.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Director Woldruff informed the Planning Commission that the City Council had appointed Mr. Charles Umeda as the new Alternate Planning Commissioner.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Neff, seconded by Patel, and carried to adjourn the meeting to the adjourned meeting of July 21, 2004. (Essex and Rosenbaum absent)

The meeting was adjourned at 10 p.m.

Minutes approved at the special meeting of November 10, 2004.

Administrative Secretary